

*CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF THE SCIENCES
POLICY MANUAL*

October 2016

*CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF THE SCIENCES
POLICY MANUAL*

Table of Contents

1. COLLEGE ORGANIZATION	1
1.1. OFFICE OF THE DEAN	1
1.2. STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE COLLEGE.....	1
1.3. AD HOC COMMITTEES OF THE COLLEGE	2
1.4. DEPARTMENT CHAIRS	2
2. USE OF UNIVERSITY PROPERTY	3
2.1. PERSONAL COMPUTER EQUIPMENT.....	3
3. CURRICULUM	3
3.1. CURRICULUM HANDBOOK.....	3
3.2. COURSE NUMBERING	3
4. INSTRUCTION	4
4.1. COURSE OUTLINES AND SYLLABI.....	4
4.2. COURSE SUBSTITUTION.....	4
5. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS	4
5.1. COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT PROVISIONS.....	4
5.2. FACULTY HIRING PROCEDURES	4
6. FACULTY WORKLOAD	7
6.1. WORKLOAD FOR FULL TIME FACULTY	7
6.2. OVERLOAD ASSIGNMENTS	8
6.3. ALTERNATE ASSIGNMENTS	8
6.4. CONSULTING AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.....	8
7. PERFORMANCE REVIEW	8
7.2. DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.....	15
7.3. PROFESSIONAL RECORD.....	15
7.4. REVIEW DEADLINES, REVISION OF DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE STANDARD, AND EXTERNAL LETTERS 16	
7.5. LEVELS OF REVIEW	16
7.6. CHAIR REVIEW.....	17
8. FISCAL POLICIES	17
8.1. GRANTS.....	17

College of the Sciences Policy Manual

This policy manual describes the operating principles of the Central Washington University College of the Sciences (COTS). College faculty and the council of chairs, composed of the dean, associate deans, and department chairs have collaborated to develop these policies. These policies were developed in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement reached by *Central Washington University and the United Faculty of Central Washington University, September 1, 2013 – August 31, 2017* (hereafter “collective bargaining agreement” or “CBA”), which takes precedence over college policies. To avoid repetition, the reader is commonly referred to the CBA. Departmental policies augment the policies of the college and the university.

The COTS Policy Manual is updated to reflect changes in policy. Current versions of the manual and forms are maintained on the documents page of the college's web site, <http://www.cwu.edu/sciences/documents-reports-and-links>

1. College Organization

1.1. Office of the Dean

The Dean of the College of the Sciences is the chief academic, budgetary, and personnel officer of the college. The dean's staff includes two associate deans, two administrative assistants, a fiscal specialist/secretary, and one or two student office assistant(s).

1.1.1. The dean's primary administrative responsibilities are personnel appointment and review, budgetary actions, program approval, program review, grant administration, policy determination, liaison to the higher administration, and fundraising.

1.1.2. The Associate Dean for Curriculum and Undergraduate Studies (ADCUS) is the primary administrator for curriculum review and assessment, program review/strategic planning, programs at the university centers, student appeals, summer session, academic reporting such as accreditation review, support for faculty scholarship and student research, and other duties as assigned.

1.1.3. The Associate Dean for Inter-Science Support (ADI-SS) is the primary administrator for community outreach and engagement, public programming, oversight of STEP, Science Honors, CESME, Museum of Culture and Environment, and interdepartmental relations. This position assists the ADCUS with assessment and strategic planning.

1.1.4. The Admissions Counselors, provided by Enrollment Management, interacts with high school and community college students and staff with the goal of increasing college enrollment.

1.1.5. The administrative assistants maintain budgetary and personnel records of the college and advise the dean and associate deans on those matters. The fiscal specialist/secretary maintains communications between the dean's office and the university and manages interdisciplinary program budgets.

1.2. Standing Committees of the College

1.2.1. Council of Department Chairs

The Council of Department Chairs meets regularly to advise the dean and to discuss matters relating to college budgeting and administration. Its membership includes department chairs, associate deans, administrative assistant, and dean.

1.2.2. Interdisciplinary Programs Committee

The Interdisciplinary Programs Committee meets regularly to advise the dean and associate dean regarding program administration. Its membership includes directors of interdisciplinary programs with residence in

the College of the Sciences, and associate deans. Approved charters for Interdisciplinary Programs are maintained on the COTS webpage.

1.2.3. College Personnel Committee

The College Personnel Committee recommends to the dean regarding personnel actions in accordance with Article 22 of the collective bargaining agreement. Five full professors elected by the tenured faculty in accordance with CBA Article 22.5.2 compose the membership of the College Personnel Committee. The election process will ensure representation from natural, mathematics and computer science and social science areas within the college.

1.3. Ad Hoc Committees of the College

The dean may appoint committees with specific charges of limited duration.

1.4. Department Chairs

1.4.1. General Provisions

The election of department chairs is governed by CBA Article 12.3.

1.4.2. Chair Election Guidelines (for complete guidelines see CBA 12.3.1.a-g)

- 1.4.2.1. When a vacancy occurs, all voting faculty are notified that the chair position is open, notified of the nomination meeting or process, and notified of the time and place of the election meeting.
- 1.4.2.2. Nominations for chair are sought by the dean prior to the election to accommodate faculty members who can't be present at the election.
- 1.4.2.3. Nomination and self-nomination may be made verbally or submitted to the dean in writing. The dean seeks consent to serve if elected from each nominee.
- 1.4.2.4. All voting faculty members are notified of the nominees. Sufficient time is allowed for the candidates to present their views of department leadership. The department may meet in order to interview, hear statements, or read written statements from each nominee.
- 1.4.2.5. The dean presides over the election at a scheduled meeting. Eligible faculty who cannot attend the meeting may submit an absentee ballot or written proxy to the dean prior to the election meeting.
- 1.4.2.6. Only tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty holding the rank of senior lecturer or assistant professor in the department are eligible to vote in the election (CBA 12.3.1.b).
- 1.4.2.7. The vote is taken by secret ballot. The dean announces the winner but does not reveal the vote distribution.

1.4.3 Academic Year Compensation

1.4.3.1 Department chairs are compensated in accordance with CBA Article 12.6.

1.4.3.2 Department chair duties will be reassigned from the instructional portion of faculty workloads.

1.4.3.2.1 The nominal chair assignment in the College of the Sciences for the nine month academic year will be 18 workload units and the maximal assignment will be 36 workload units. Chairs are also compensated an additional 2.5 workload units for each of the periods September 1-15 and June 16-30 (total contract w/us for year = 50 w/us).

1.4.3.2.2 Assignment of greater than 18 workload units will be negotiated with the dean based on the number of FTE faculty in the department, the complexity of department programs, and historical work demands in the department.

1.4.3.2.3 Chairs may request additional workload reassignment for years in which a greater than normal amount of administrative activity is anticipated (e.g., years in which program or

accreditation reviews occur). Normally the range for such an additional reassignment will be from 2 to 4 workload units.

1.4.3.2.3 In consultation with the dean, a chair may allocate a portion of her/his assigned workload units to other faculty in the department (e.g., to appoint someone assistant chair, or to secure assistance with program review and assessment). Normally the range for such assignments will be from 2 to 5 workload units.

1.4.3.3 Department chairs typically serve a 10-month appointment, from September 1 to June 30.

1.4.3.4 Chairs continue to be eligible for the reappointment, tenure, performance and compression adjustment, and promotion opportunities normally associated with their faculty positions.

1.4.3.5 Department chair compensation for summer session is determined by CWUP 5-110-030.

2. Use of University Property

2.1. Personal Computer Equipment

University employees and students may connect personal computer equipment to the university network under the conditions listed in the COTS personal computer use agreement form. The computer will be operated in compliance with all CWU computer use policies while the equipment is on campus or connected to the campus network. Computer use policies may be obtained from Information Services' website.

3. Curriculum

3.1. Curriculum Handbook

3.1.1. The CWU Curriculum Policies and Procedures Manual, maintained by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, describes the university's curriculum policies. The manual is available on CWU's web page.

3.1.2. COTS affirms that the teaching faculty collectively is the major force governing the curriculum of the university. The faculty acts through the departments, the deans, college curriculum committees, the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate to complete the curricular process

3.2. Course Numbering

In addition to Academic Affairs policy governing course numbering, the following stipulations apply:

3.2.1. Course numbers will have appropriate 3-digit designations, consistent with university guidelines. Four-digit numbers in COTS have been eliminated.

3.2.2. When credit and non-credit bearing labs are affiliated with a designated course, the 3-digit course number is followed by the suffix "LAB".

3.2.3. Course numbers in the 90's series numbers will use the appropriate level of offering for the first digit, and will:

3.2.3.1. Conform to university policy on second and third digit descriptions, including:

90 -- Cooperative Education

91 -- Workshops

92 to 95 -- Professional Laboratory Experience, Practicum, and Field Experience (see college guidelines below)

96 -- Individual Study. 1-6 credits. May be repeated if subject is different.

97 -- Honors. 1-12 credits. Prerequisite, admission to department honors program.

98 -- Special Topics. 1-6 credits.

3.2.3.2. 99 -- Seminar. 1-6 credits. May be repeated if subject is different. In addition, 90's series numbers will conform to college level policy on second and third digit descriptions, including:

- 92 -- Experience in teaching, such as undergraduate teaching assistant
- 93 -- To be used as needed
- 94 -- To be used for project, such as GIS project
- 95 -- Student or directed research

4. Instruction

4.1. Course Outlines and Syllabi

- 4.1.1. A syllabus forms a complete statement of the course content and learning objectives independent of who teaches the course. A course outline, typically embedded in the syllabus distributed to students in a given course section, describes operational details such as reading and other assignments, lecture topics, examination dates and grading standards.
- 4.1.2. At the beginning of each quarter, faculty members are required to distribute a written syllabus with course outline to students in every class and submit a current copy to the department syllabus file. The course outline forms a common understanding between professor and student and lays out student and instructor obligations in a university class. A syllabus should include:
 - Instructor name, phone number, office location, e-mail contact, and office hours.
 - Texts and other required and optional instructional materials.
 - A statement of the purpose of the course.
 - A list of student learning objectives and how each will be assessed.
 - A schedule of reading, assignment, and examination dates. If dates will be determined during the quarter and announced in class, this should be stated.
 - A clear statement of how the course grade will be determined, including factors such as attendance, quality of contribution to class discussion, etc.
 - A description of the instructor's policy regarding makeup examinations.
 - A description of the consequences of proscribed behavior.
 - An ADA statement following this wording: "Students who have special needs or disabilities that may affect their ability to access information or material presented in this course should contact the CWU Director of Disability Services at 509-963-1202 for appropriate accommodation."

4.2. Course Substitution

- 4.2.1. The chair has the authority to approve student requests for major or minor course substitutions for programs within the department.
- 4.2.2. The interdisciplinary program director has the authority to approve student requests for course substitutions in interdisciplinary programs.
- 4.2.3. When COTS courses are required by programs in other colleges, the relevant COTS chair should be consulted about course substitutions. The authority for approving substitutions lies with the program, however.

5. Faculty Appointments

5.1. Collective Bargaining Agreement Provisions

Conditions governing faculty appointments are found in Articles 8, 9, and 10 of the CBA.

5.2. Faculty Hiring Procedures

Faculty search procedures follow processes approved by the provost, human resources and dean, who acts as appointing authority. The hiring process follows CWUP 2-30-200 and CWUR 7-40-140. The department chair initiates a request to fill a vacancy. After approval by the dean and provost, the search flow is established on the Human Resources web site. This section summarizes policy and procedures at the college level. It complements

the hiring process posted by human resources. Both sets of guidelines should be used to ensure conformance with both college and HR standards.

5.2.1. Hiring Tenure-track faculty

5.2.1.1. Request to Fill Tenure-track Vacancy (initiated by chair, approved by dean and provost):

- Written justification for need, sub-discipline focus, and conformance with strategic goals or program review.
- Tenure track searches for an assistant professor, salary level should bracket the CUPA mean for starting assistant professors. For searches at higher rank, salary range should be determined in consultation with the dean.
- Position description including minimum and preferred qualifications.
- Proposed membership of the search committee. If this is not approved at this point in the process, approval by the dean needs to occur prior to initiating meetings. Committees must include female and minority representation. For positions that support professional education programs, committees require a member of the School of Education. Committee responsibilities, including confidentiality guidelines, are detailed by human resources (See www.cwu.edu/hr/recruiting-hiring).

5.2.1.2. Faculty Recruitment Plan Approval:

- Search committee works with HR Consultant and the dean for framing position description, announcement and review of the recruitment plan.
- Recruitment plan. National search required for tenure track posts, 30-day posting required without special approval of the dean and Human Resources.
- Position announcement and advertising. Department must follow search procedures outlined in HR Search Manual. Do not post announcements without dean's review and approval.

5.2.1.3. Screening:

- Screening instrument; must be approved by human resources
- Rationale for proceeding with search if availability is not met; dean's approval required.
- Rationale for proceeding if pool is small; dean's approval required.
- If the pool is small (for instance, fewer than 10 applicants in a tenure track search have met minimum qualifications), a meeting with the dean may be requested to explore continuing the search.

5.2.1.4. Interview Approval (initiated by chair, approved by dean and HR consultant). Candidates recommended for interview emerge as the most qualified from the pool. In addition to application materials, references and phone interviews form the basis for this priority. Dean's approval is based upon review of:

- C.V. and letters of reference for each finalist (for non-tenure track searches, detailed notes summarizing strengths and weaknesses from verbal reference checks may be used instead of letters)
- For tenure track searches, schedule for meetings with each candidate during the on-campus interview. The schedule should include a scholarly presentation and/or a teaching demonstration.

5.2.1.5. Hiring proposal

- Committee summary of strengths and weaknesses for each finalist
- Rationale for selection or ranking
- Any special terms or conditions of appointment
- HR background check must be completed before final offer can be made

5.2.1.6. The dean in consultation with the department chair determines rank, salary, length of the probationary period, startup support, and special conditions of the appointment, within the provisions of the collective bargaining agreement (e.g., CBA Article 22.3.3(a).

- 5.2.1.6.1. Startup funding may be provided to equip a faculty member to deliver laboratory/field curriculum and scholarship. It is intended to seed externally funded grants. This funding and any requirements of, or restrictions on, its use will be stipulated in the contract letter.
- 5.2.1.6.2. When a candidate does not receive the terminal degree, by the time employment begins, CBA Article 8.2.5 and Academic Affairs policies apply.
- 5.2.1.7. The offer is tendered by the dean, and is followed by a formal contract letter detailing the terms presented. The offer stipulates all conditions of hire, including rank, salary, duration of probationary period, scheduled year of tenure consideration, possible startup support, and any other special terms of the appointment.
- 5.2.1.8. Final approval of faculty contracts lies with Board of Trustees on the recommendation of the provost and president. The dean notifies the successful candidate of final contract approval.
- 5.2.2. Contracting Lecturers
- 5.2.2.1. Establishing pools:
- 5.2.2.1.1. Establish a posting for a lecturer to generate a lecturer pool on Recruiting Solutions. Separate pools for part time and full time lecturers may be appropriate.
- 5.2.2.1.2. Pools need to be renewed annually, on a calendar year basis.
- 5.2.2.1.3. On the first submission, complete materials including a new official transcript (for the highest degree that qualifies the candidate for the teaching assignment) are required. In subsequent submissions, materials may be reactivated or new materials provided where credentials or experience has changed.
- 5.2.2.2. Requesting part-time appointments:
- 5.2.2.2.1. Forward recommendations for hire to the dean on a contract request form, drawing on qualified individuals from the pool. Prior to employment HR will conduct a background check to verify advanced degree and provide notice of criminal history.
- 5.2.2.2.2. Faculty on quarterly contracts with an assignment in excess of 15 workload units can be paid for overload on the quarterly assignment at the appropriate lecturer rate.
- 5.2.2.3. Establishing a one-year full time lecturer position:
In order to establish a full time lecturer position for the year, submit the request to fill a position located on the COTS website and attach:
- Brief justification based on instructional need, indicating how this need has been met in previous years. If it is a new or one-time need, the dean must seek higher-level approval.
 - Summary of anticipated funding sources.
 - Current department load plan showing the requested assignment.
- 5.2.2.4. Recommending candidates for one-year appointment:
- 5.2.2.4.1. If the candidate was previously qualified through Equal Opportunity for a similar appointment, and a current review of instruction that meets the accreditation standard is on file in the dean's office, forward:
- Contract request form with the requested annual load
 - Current C.V. & other application materials
- 5.2.2.4.2. If the candidate has not previously been qualified through an Equal Opportunity process, a search is required. Review eligible applications in the pool and provide a rationale for qualifying a particular candidate against the pool. The final recommendation will be substantiated by the following:
- Applicant log with rationale for recommendation on each candidate

- Contract request form with full annual load
- Current C.V. & other application materials

5.2.2.5. Contracting full time lecturers:

- 5.2.2.5.1. For full time non-tenure track appointments, salary levels are established at the college level based on terminal degree and CBA requirements.
- 5.2.2.5.2. The annual assignment will be paid evenly all three quarters.
- 5.2.2.5.3. When more than 45 workload units are requested, pay rate will be at the appropriate lecturer rate for units in excess of 45 and the overload will be paid in the quarter that the annual load is exceeded.
- 5.2.2.5.4. If an assignment changes after an annual contract is issued, remuneration may need to be adjusted to account for net changes in the assignment. In this case, a revised contract will be issued.

6. *Faculty Workload*

6.1. *Workload for Full Time Faculty*

- 6.1.1. Workload assignment is governed by CBA Article 15. The workload unit is the basic unit of faculty activity.
- 6.1.2. Chairs assign, and dean approves, faculty workload in instruction to meet university requirements and staffing needs. These include general education, service courses, major and graduate programs within the discipline, as well as interdisciplinary and university instructional programs.
- 6.1.3. A full time annual workload is 45 workload units assigned in the areas of instruction (CBA Article 15.3.1.a), scholarship (CBA Article 15.3.1.b), and service (CBA Article 15.3.2).
 - 6.1.3.1. Tenured and tenure-track faculty typically carry assignment in all three areas (CBA Article 13.2, 13.4).
 - 6.1.3.1.1. For tenured and tenure track faculty, 80% effort is typically allocated to direct instruction. Reductions in instruction are typically funded from sources external to the university or college, or are part of a formal administrative assignment requested by the university, such as department chair.
 - 6.1.3.1.2. For tenured and tenure track faculty, workload assigned in research supports the continuing academic qualifications of the faculty, program strength, and the university's advancement of knowledge (CBA Article 13.2).
 - 6.1.3.1.3. For tenured and tenure track faculty, service is essential to the functioning of the university, professions, and contributes to community life (CBA Article 13.2).
 - 6.1.3.2. The letter contract specifies workload for non-tenure track faculty on fixed-term appointments (CBA Article 13.3).
 - 6.1.3.3. Faculty members perform professional duties consistent with CBA Article 13.
 - 6.1.3.4. Workload units for team-taught classes will be divided equally among the participating faculty members unless otherwise assigned by the dean in consultation with the department chair.
 - 6.1.3.5. Independent study, student research, thesis, and other individual student supervision may be formally assigned as part of workload; this assignment is limited to the load specified in the workload plan, to a maximum of six workload units per academic year for individual faculty members.

6.2. Overload Assignments

- 6.2.1. Annual workload in excess of 45 workload units per academic year is considered an overload for annually contracted faculty; quarterly workload in excess of 15 workload units per quarter is considered an overload for quarterly contracts (CBA Articles 15.4.3, 16.9).
- 6.2.2. Overload assignments are discouraged, and are typically assigned only when unforeseen staffing shortages arise. An overload must be assigned by the chair and approved by the dean and provost in advance. It is paid when the workload units specified in 6.2.1 are exceeded.
- 6.2.3. An overload is remunerated as stipulated in CBA Article 16.9.
- 6.2.4. Overloads are limited to 20% (9 workload units) of the annual academic year contract.
- 6.2.5. Faculty work as part of an overload is performed and evaluated in excess of regularly established performance expectations.

6.3. Alternate Assignments

- 6.3.1. Faculty may be assigned non-teaching activities in lieu of regular 80% instructional workload units. These are typically funded from sources external to the university or college; such as research leave supported by the School of Graduate Studies and Research, research program development, technical training, professional leave, and grant-funded research.
- 6.3.2. Alternate assignments, budget sources, and performance expectations are identified and approved through the annual workload plan. The duties, workload units, and budget source are specified on the workload plan.
- 6.3.3. Alternate assignments must be activities required by the university, assigned by the department chair, and approved by the dean.

6.4. Consulting and Conflicts of Interest

- 6.4.1. Unremunerated consulting may be consistent with the university's mission to make faculty expertise available to the public (CBA Articles 15.3.2.a, 14.4).
- 6.4.2. Remunerated consulting activity that interferes with the performance of primary faculty duties, such as meeting classes as scheduled, is proscribed. Remunerated consulting requires advance approval of the dean and provost, on recommendation of the department chair, subject to the state ethics guidelines, Board of Trustees and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (Article 14).
- 6.4.3. Externally compensated consulting activities, commissioned manuscripts, and other works for hire cannot be counted as part of faculty workload.
- 6.4.4. Faculty members may not use university resources in pursuit of remunerated consulting activities without compensating the university (Article 14.7).

7. Performance Review

The performance of COTS faculty and staff is periodically reviewed in conformance with accreditation standards, university policy, and state law. This review supports effective job performance and identifies areas where professional development would be beneficial to the university; it is coordinated at the college level.

7.1. College Standards for Faculty Review

Tenured and tenure track faculty members are reviewed for reappointment, tenure, promotion, post-tenure review (R/T/P/PTR) and merit. The process and schedules for each type of review are specified in the collective bargaining agreement (CBA Article 22.2), the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines, the Academic Affairs policy manual, and the Academic Affairs annual calendar; the required materials are detailed on the COTS cover sheet for to each type of

review. The office of faculty relations maintains the official copy of the professional record. Notification of required periodic review follows the timelines laid out in the annual academic affairs calendar.

In conformance with university standards, review of tenured and tenure-track faculty centers on the three required performance areas: instruction, scholarship, and service. In addition to the university standards, the College of the Sciences requires faculty to treat students, campus visitors, and other university employees (regardless of rank or employment type) in a professional and collegial manner at all times. This college standard applies whether one is on or off campus. *Failure to act in a professional and collegial manner can negatively impact performance evaluations, including the granting of tenure, promotion and merit.* Non-tenure track faculty and phased retirees are evaluated for instruction; other duties are evaluated when they are part of their contract. Non-tenure track faculty are expected to meet the same collegiality standard as the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

7.1.1.Instruction: Standard and Evaluation

- 7.1.1.1. Effective instruction is the central element of faculty work.
- 7.1.1.2. Effective instruction requires thoughtful and responsive course design, development of appropriate instructional techniques, articulation of student learning objectives, assessment of student learning, and maintenance of the completeness and currency of a faculty member's understanding of his or her discipline. Effective teaching is shaped by formal evaluation and by ongoing professional development. It is important to note that, while the elements of teaching that are evaluated for faculty members remain consistent at each level of review, the expectations for quality of performance progress as faculty move through the ranks. Thus, the college requires *effective teaching* for the associate professor rank and *excellent teaching* for the full professor rank. Effective teaching means that any areas identified in prior levels of review as needing improvement have been substantively addressed, and the faculty candidate has a record of responsiveness to student learning needs both inside and beyond the classroom. *Excellent teaching* means that the faculty candidate has met all the criteria for *effective teaching* and in addition has demonstrated excellence through several sources of evidence, such as: a sustained pattern of positive SEOI results, demonstrated both numerically and through student comments, teaching awards, published pedagogical scholarship, student and peer reviews/testimonials, a pattern of significant academic progress or career achievement by students, curriculum development, and/or similar evidence of commendable accomplishments in teaching. Departments may define additional criteria for effective and excellent teaching that are in line with their disciplines.
- 7.1.1.3. The college values multiple modes of instruction and recognizes that student learning occurs in a variety of field, laboratory, research, classroom, and other settings and contexts. Delivery of instruction and its evaluation should reflect this diversity.
- 7.1.1.4. The administration of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI) is required in all courses with five or more students. Departments and individual faculty may develop their own instruments and means of teaching evaluation to complement but not to replace the SEOI.
- 7.1.1.5. Departments must retain summaries of SEOI quantitative and qualitative (written comments) results, in accordance with college and department policies.
- 7.1.1.6. In conformance with University Faculty Criteria Guidelines for R/T/P/PTR, and NWCCU accreditation standards, all teaching faculty are evaluated using multiple methods that typically include: student evaluation of instruction; peer evaluation through classroom observation, review of syllabi and/or course materials; self-reflection and reflective statements; department/program supervisor (chair/program director) evaluation; assessment of student learning objectives. The instruments and results of evaluation are to be included in the professional record portfolio submitted for R/T/P/RTR.
- 7.1.1.7. Non-tenure track faculty members are expected to maintain effective teaching. The department chair and personnel committee chair evaluate NTT faculty performance on an annual basis.

- 7.1.1.8. Candidates for reappointment shall demonstrate concrete evidence of effective teaching and professional growth.
- 7.1.1.9. Candidates for tenure shall demonstrate a pattern of productivity that demonstrates effectiveness in teaching and promises sustained productivity in the classroom, field, lab, and other settings throughout their career.
- 7.1.1.10. Candidates for promotion are evaluated in accordance with the University Faculty Standard Performance. Effective teaching demonstrated through the evaluation specified in 7.1.1.6 and through progressive professional growth is required for promotion to associate professor. Teaching that consistently exceeds expectations and commands the respect of faculty and students is required for promotion to professor.
- 7.1.1.11. Faculty undergoing post-tenure review are expected to maintain rank-appropriate levels of performance in teaching. A few pertinent examples include: evidence of continuous updating of course materials and teaching strategies, rigorous course work appropriate to course level, high standards for evaluation of student work, effective communication with students, and taking on additional teaching assignments that meet curricular needs of department and program(s).
- 7.1.1.12. In addition, in order to be considered for merit adjustment based on instructional performance through PTR, a full professor must continue to meet department, college and university teaching criteria for promotion to full professor. That is, one must provide evidence that her/his instructional performance levels consistently exceed expectations and command the respect of faculty and students (see 7.1.1.2 and 7.1.1.10).

7.1.2 Research and Scholarly Activity

Research and scholarly activity are essential duties of university faculty, and are valued for their contribution to instruction, service, professional development, and the advancement of knowledge. Scholarship takes many forms and is characterized by differing levels of peer-reviewed rigor and dissemination outside the university.

7.1.2.1. *Category A Accomplishments*

University and accreditation standards recognize that research and the dissemination of completed scholarship in rigorous peer-reviewed venues is an essential form of validation for all tenured and tenure-track faculty members. Peer-reviewed accomplishments correspond to *Category A* products in the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines.

7.1.2.1.1 At the college level *Category A* accomplishments include outputs that are widely recognized as being subject to formal and rigorous peer-review processes and disseminated outside the university. These include:

- refereed journal articles
- research monographs
- scholarly books and chapters
- textbooks and chapters in textbooks
- juried museum exhibitions and installations
- successful agency or foundation grants that involve nationally recognized peer-review award criteria (e.g. NSF, NIH, DOE, ILMS, NEH, NEA) if the faculty member is the principal investigator or one of the co-principal investigators with significant intellectual contribution to the project
- Large scale agency contract work (e.g., 1-90 Wildlife Corridor Project) and applied research studies that produce significant positive change in the functioning of natural systems, communities, government agencies, NGO or businesses may constitute *Category A* accomplishments. The burden is on the principal investigator or co-principle investigators and department(s) to make the case that recommended actions were embraced by organizational leaders and led to significant positive

change in actions, processes, or behaviors.

- Published, peer-reviewed conference articles and proceedings (to count as *Category A* the entire manuscript, not just the abstract, must have been subject to peer review)
- Additional categories may be included at the department level with the dean's approval. Departments may identify discipline specific equivalents based on standards that have been approved at the college and university levels.

7.1.2.1.2 Acceptable *Category A* Venues

With the ongoing proliferation of predatory journals, open source journals, online journals, and print-on-demand book publishers, it is not always a simple matter to tell what venues are "widely recognized as being subject to formal and rigorous peer-review processes and disseminated outside the university" as called for in 7.1.2.2.

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1xv148c8>. See also, Appendix A *The peer-review process*.

7.1.2.1.3 Documentation of peer review:

- The college does not seek to create an unnecessary burden of documentation; there is no need to document publication or funding venues that are well known to have rigorous peer review (e.g., major journals in one's field, large foundation and government grant awards, books published by established academic publishing concerns, etc.).
- For largely unknown publication or funding venues, or those that do not have a well-known reputation for quality peer-review processes, faculty should have the opportunity to demonstrate valid procedures exist. The evidence should be included in the faculty member's professional record. For this reason, the college recommends that faculty retain records of the peer review process and all communication with editors.

7.1.2.2. *Category B* Accomplishments

- Other forms of faculty scholarship are not subjected to peer-review but nonetheless enrich the intellectual life of the faculty, the students, and the university. These accomplishments are identified by the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines as *Category B* products.

7.1.2.2.1 *Category B* accomplishments include products and activities such as:

- Unsuccessful proposal submissions for peer-reviewed external grants (e.g. NSF, NIH, DOE, ILMS, NEH, NEA) if the faculty member is the principal investigator or one of the co-principal investigators with significant intellectual contribution to the project
- Applied studies and agency contract work that a faculty member's department found not to be sufficiently impactful in scope or outcome to constitute a *Category A* product
- Grants obtained and primarily executed before arriving at CWU
- Other grants and contracts, if the faculty member is the principal investigator
- Publicly available research and technical papers (e.g., studies formally entered into a state agency's records which is open to the public)
- Conference paper and poster presentations, and invited talks
- Published test banks, study guides, and pedagogical resources subjected to editorial review by an academic publishing company or governmental agency
- Book reviews
- Entries in recognized academic encyclopedias

- Minor agency contract reports
- Additional categories may be included at the department level with the dean's approval

7.1.2.2.2 College Standard for Scholarship Output for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Status

Faculty are expected to make regular contributions to **both** *Category A* and *Category B* products. The college standard for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor is:

- Two *Category A* products produced while in residence at CWU. Department standards will define the exact nature of what will and won't count while in residence at CWU.
- In rare instances a department may require a lesser number of outputs due to a paucity of acceptable peer-reviewed venues or avenues of research support, or in disciplines with a documented culture of generally more modest publishing rates. When such conditions exist, they must be fully documented by the department and the variance in expectations approved by the dean. Departments may place higher expectations on their faculty. However, the department must provide evidence that this would not produce an unfair burden on its tenure-track faculty compared to those in other college departments. The dean must formally approve the variation.
- By the time of tenure or promotional consideration the candidate must have completed at least one *Category A* product that was entirely or at least substantially conducted at CWU. The candidate must demonstrate the ability to take a research topic from the conceptual stage through analysis to successful peer-reviewed dissemination while in residence at CWU. Review at the college level expects the candidate to explain how much effort in a manuscript was completed at CWU. Work initiated elsewhere but only minimally completed at Central would not satisfy this requirement. However, it would fulfill the requirement of a second *Category A* accomplishment if it lists CWU as the affiliated site. In the case of departments that require a single publication for tenure or promotional consideration, this would not satisfy the college requirement for a *Category A* output that was substantially undertaken while at CWU.
- At the time of tenure and promotion consideration the college expects to see evidence that the faculty member is highly likely to carry out a sustained record of scholarship. This can be substantiated through evidence of projects in different stages of development.
- Faculty members are especially encouraged to mentor students in research leading to external dissemination.
- Work initiated at CWU while a non-tenure track faculty member counts towards publication requirements.
- Collaborative research leading to publication is valued by the college. However, it critical that candidates listing co-authored products as proof that one has met the expectations for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor explain their role in the project. They must provide clear evidence that they undertook a primary role in the project's conception, planning, funding, data acquisition, data analysis, literature review, writing and editing. Simply listing oneself as a co-

author does not sufficiently inform evaluators to determine if a particular candidate has met the spirit implied by the requirement of having “completed at least one *Category A* product that was substantially conducted and completed at CWU.”

7.1.2.2.3 College Standard for Scholarship Output for Promotion to Full Professor Promotion to the rank of full professor requires a record of *excellence* in scholarship.

- Evidence of *excellence* in scholarship must exceed department, college and university standards for *acceptable* performance.
- Candidates for promotion to full professor shall provide evidence of regular and substantive contributions of peer-reviewed scholarly work in the categories listed in 7.1.2.2 or comparable products when these have been established by university-approved department personnel standards. These products shall be complemented by scholarly activities such as those listed in 7.1.2.3 in accordance with the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines.

7.1.2.2.4 External Review of Scholarship

When departments request the evaluation of scholarship by external experts as part of the tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review consideration special procedures for soliciting and handling external evaluations apply. The procedures must be defined in the department policy and approved by the dean. Solicitation of an external evaluation of scholarship for tenure, post-tenure review, or promotion decisions by the department, dean, or office of the provost must adhere to a routine and clearly specified process. When such evaluation is solicited, opinions from a mix of experts in the relevant sub-discipline are required. The request should identify the activities for which an evaluation is solicited (scholarship), and provide a portfolio that supports the requested evaluation. The candidate may suggest some such experts; a department specified proportion of not less than half of the solicited evaluations must be from people whose names are not provided by the candidate. In support of the confidentiality and objectivity of such evaluation, the letters will be kept in a sealed envelope in the faculty member’s professional file in the office of the provost. Only those who formally recommend a personnel action may access the evaluations of the candidate during the review process. The letters will not be made available to the candidate. Faculty members who participate in professional education programs may also seek review by the School of Education.

7.1.3. Service: Standard and Evaluation

- 7.1.3.1 Service is an essential element of faculty life; faculty service contributes expertise and effort to departments, the university, professional communities of scholars, and the citizenry.
- 7.1.3.2. University service is assigned in accordance with university policy. The dean, in consultation with the department chair, assigns college level service. The department chair assigns department level service.
- 7.1.3.3. University, professional, and public service activities are specified in Article 15.3.2 and Appendix A of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Service activities are defined in CBA Article 15.3.2 and may include participation in university governance, public lectures, service as chair or program director, unremunerated consultancies, community activities related to one's discipline, advisement of student organizations, service to professional organizations, and contributions to department operations and activities. Faculty members are especially encouraged to mentor and collaborate

with students in community service. Departments may establish tailored guidelines for appropriate types and levels of discipline-specific faculty service activities established by departmental standards that have been approved at the college and university levels.

7.1.3.4. Faculty members are responsible for providing documentation of service activities and contributions in their professional files.

7.1.3.4.1 Candidates for reappointment shall demonstrate progressive growth towards appropriate service contributions.

7.1.3.4.2 Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor are evaluated in accordance with the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines, which requires evidence of substantive contributions to university, professional and/or community service. The candidate shall demonstrate a pattern of productivity that demonstrates appropriate or *acceptable* contributions in service and promises sustained productivity throughout their career.

7.1.3.4.3 Candidates for promotion to full professor must exhibit a record of *excellence* in service. The criteria for *excellence* must exceed department, college, and university standards for *acceptable* performance. In addition, candidates are evaluated in accordance with the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines which requires sustained contributions to university life, and increasing service to professional organizations and/or the community for promotion to full professor.

7.1.3.4.4. Faculty members undergoing post-tenure review are expected to provide evidence of sustained contributions in university, professional and community service appropriate to their discipline, tenure, and rank. At a minimum, in order to be considered for merit adjustment based on service performance through PTR, a full professor must demonstrate that he/she has continued to meet department, college and university criteria for *excellence* in service (7.1.3.4.3).

7.1.4 Post-tenure review:

- Post-tenure review assures continued performance in assigned areas of faculty work at appropriate rank and consistent with the university mission and accreditation standards. Performance in the three areas of faculty work is typically expected during any five-year post-tenure review cycle
- In accord with accreditation standards, all tenured faculty members are expected to sustain scholarly activity, during any given post-tenure review period. The balance of instruction, scholarship, and service may evolve throughout an individual's career and performance expectations in each category are established through the workload plan that is assigned by the department and approved by the dean. If scholarship workload units are consistently requested and assigned, a commensurate level of scholarship outcomes is expected.
- Performance in the three areas of faculty work is typically expected during any five-year post-tenure review cycle, but evaluation will be based on a faculty member's approved workload plan. Department standards will articulate discipline-specific expectations for post-tenure review.

7.1.4.1 Post-tenure review merit (CBA Article 16.6)

Post-tenure review assures continued performance that is consistent with expectations of rank for assigned areas of faculty work and in line with the university mission and accreditation standards. In order to be considered for merit adjustment based on scholarship, teaching, or service performance through PTR, a full professor must demonstrate that he/she has continued to meet department, college and university criteria for excellence in the appropriate area (see 7.1.1, 7.1.2, 7.1.3)

- Faculty must provide qualitative and quantitative evidence of excellence in the areas defined in Articles 16.6.1 and 16.6.2 that clearly exceed the usual standards expected of Full Professors.
- For purposes of determining merit, *excellence* in teaching is defined in 7.1.1.2 above and by department standards for excellence in teaching; *excellence* in scholarship and creative work is defined by 7.1.2.7 above and department standards for excellence in scholarship; and *excellence* in service is defined in 7.1.3.4.3 above and

by department standards for excellence in service.

7.1.4.3 Merit Salary Increases for Department Chairs (CBA 16.6)

According to Article 16.6.3, “those chairs who are judged at the conclusion of their Post-TR review to be excellent in chairpersonship will receive a three percent (3.0%) increase in their base salary.” CBA Article 12.5 on the evaluation of department chairs states: “The appropriate dean shall periodically evaluate the chair and meet with the chair to discuss the results of the evaluation. Department faculty shall provide input into the evaluation through the process described in the college evaluation plans.” There is a minimum of a 66% response from eligible voters as detailed in Appendix B of this document.

- The Dean will conduct an evaluation of a department chair in the spring prior to the chair’s PTR review (or in an outgoing chair’s last year of service).
- Department Chairs must provide qualitative and quantitative evidence of excellence that exceeds the usual standards expected of Chairs (Articles 12.4, 12.5 and 16.6.3).
- The Dean’s letter will evaluate the chair using the closed-ended and open-ended items listed on the Chair Evaluation Form (as completed by department faculty and staff) and the dean’s experience with the chair’s performance on these same measures.
- The variables measured and considered are: Department Operations, Interpersonal Skills, Leadership Skills, and Assessment of the Chair’s Greatest Strengths and Challenges.
- Excellence in chairpersonship will be based on a mean score of 3.5 or above on at least 20 of the analyzed variables. An average score of less than 1.5 on any item will disqualify one from merit consideration. The Dean’s letter will be included in the chair’s PTR file.

7.2. *Departmental Performance Standards*

University-approved standards guide evaluation of each faculty member by the department personnel committee and the department chair. These are developed in accordance with 22.1.1 of the CBA, and require approval of the dean and the office of the provost.

Departmental standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and for post-tenure review shall align with the university and college standards. The department will ensure that its personnel policy document is consistent with, and in no case less stringent than, college and university provisions. Periodic revision may be required.

Modification of approved criteria for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review for an individual position may sometimes be warranted. The modified criteria are agreed upon by the faculty member, the department chair in consultation with the department personnel committee, and the dean; and approved in advance by the provost. Approval at all levels must be in writing (CBA, section 29.3) and the modification must be stipulated in documents such as the initial contract letter or subsequent letters of agreement.

7.3. *Professional Record*

- 7.3.1. For all performance reviews, it is the candidate’s responsibility to assemble and present an appropriate portfolio of accomplishments during the review period, known as the professional record. The professional record provides documentation of performance in all three areas of evaluation, making clear the relationship between supporting materials and the evaluation categories and criteria.
- 7.3.2. The professional record is prepared using a standardized format associated with Faculty180. The period under review and appropriate materials vary among some review processes; the appropriate materials and review period are specified in Faculty180.

- 7.3.3. Professional records submitted in support of reappointment, tenure, and post-tenure review should include all performance evaluations, at all levels, since the initial hire. Promotion considers the record of accomplishments in current rank at CWU, and the professional record must contain all performance evaluations at all levels for that period. Previous experience may be relevant in establishing a sustained record of productivity but the criteria for promotion to a particular rank must be met during the period under consideration.
- 7.3.4. Colleagues, students, and others familiar with the candidate's work are permitted to submit letters that attest to specific contributions or qualities of the candidate relevant to their performance in any of the three evaluation areas. These letters may be submitted to the chair or personnel committee prior to the deadline for file submission.
- 7.3.5. Upon completion of the review process, professional records will be maintained in the office of the provost. Each faculty member should retain a copy of his or her professional record and the supporting materials.

7.4. *Review Deadlines, Revision of Departmental Performance Standard, and External Letters*

- 7.4.1. Eligibility for personnel action is established in the collective bargaining agreement. Deadlines for personnel evaluation and action are published in the Academic Calendar for each year. Responsibility for meeting deadlines rests with the faculty member. The academic calendar may be found on the provost's website.
- 7.4.2. Recommendation of candidates for reappointment, promotion, tenure, or post-tenure review by tenured department faculty, department personnel committee, chairs, the college personnel committee, and the dean are based on the candidate's submitted Professional Record, consistent with department, college, and university standards and other factors.

7.5. *Levels of Review*

The department personnel committee, the chair, the college personnel committee, the dean, and the provost provide official recommendations in personnel decisions as specified in CBA Articles 9, 10, and 15.

7.5.1 Department Personnel Committee

- 7.5.1.1 Committee Membership: The department personnel committee comprises at least three voting members of appropriate rank, and is established in accord with CBA Article 22.5.1.
 - 7.5.1.1.2 The dean nominates, and the provost appoints, special ad hoc committee members in accordance CBA Article 22.5.5.
- 7.5.1.2 Department review for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review follows the process established in CBA Articles 22.6.3, 22.6.4
- 7.5.1.3 As part of the formal review process, the department personnel committee reviews and evaluates the work of candidates for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review (CBA Article 22); and also reviews performance in the assigned workload for all non-tenure track faculty (CBA Article 10.2). The committee uses university, college, and department standards as the basis for evaluation and recommendation (CBA Article 22.1). The personnel committee makes separate written evaluation and recommendation to the dean.
- 7.5.1.4 After recommending on reappointment or post-tenure evaluation, the personnel committee will meet with each candidate to discuss performance and professional plans.

7.5.2 Department Chair

- 7.5.2.1. The chair meets with each new faculty member during their first quarter at CWU in order to orient them concerning reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review procedures and expectations. The chair also provides copies of student evaluation forms, describing how they are

administered and maintained in the department as well as explaining their role and significance in reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review decisions.

- 7.5.2.2 Department chair review for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review follows the process established in CBA Articles 22.6.1, 22.6.3.b.
- 7.5.2.3 As part of the formal review process, the chair evaluates the work of candidates for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review (CBA Article 22); and also reviews performance of the assigned workload for all non-tenure track faculty (CBA Article 10.2). The chair uses university, college, and department standards as the basis for evaluation and recommendation (CBA Article 22.1). The chair makes separate written evaluation and recommendation to the dean.
- 7.5.2.4 After recommending on reappointment or post-tenure evaluation, as well as periodically throughout the year, the chair will meet with each candidate to discuss performance and professional plans.

7.5.3 College Personnel Committee

- 7.5.3.1 College Personnel Committee membership eligibility and appointment is detailed in CBA Article 22.5.1 and Section 1.2.2 of this manual.
- 7.5.3.2 College level review for tenure and promotion follows the process established in CBA Article 22.6.5.
- 7.5.3.3 As part of the formal review process, the college personnel committee reviews and evaluates the work of candidates in the areas of instruction, scholarship, and service for tenure and promotion (CBA Article 22). The committee uses university, college, and department standards as the basis for evaluation and recommendation (CBA Article 22.1). The college personnel committee makes separate written evaluation and recommendation to the dean.

7.5.3 Dean

- 7.5.3.1 As part of the formal review process, the dean reviews and evaluates the work of candidates for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review (CBA Article 22).
- 7.5.2.3 The dean uses university, college, and department standards as the basis for evaluation and recommendation (CBA Article 22.1). The dean conveys college and department level recommendations to the provost.
- 7.5.2.4 The dean's review for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review follows the process established in CBA Article 22.6.5.

7.6. Chair Review

The Dean will conduct an evaluation of a department chair in the spring prior to the chair's PTR review (or in an outgoing chair's last year of service). A form for chair evaluation is available on the college's web site (See also 7.1.4.3).7.7.

7.7 Staff Review

- 7.7.1 State law and university policy require a Performance & Development Plan and annual review for classified staff. This review is typically conducted by the chair and is forwarded to the dean during spring quarter. Human Resources provides a standard format for this review.
- 7.7.2 University policy requires annual evaluations for exempt employees. This review is typically conducted during spring quarter. Exempt employees are evaluated in the elements of their position descriptions, or according to the tasks specified by grants and contracts. The review is conducted by the supervisor or chair, and is forwarded to the dean during spring quarter.

8. Fiscal Policies

8.1. Grants

- 8.1.1. Pre-approval for proposal submission is required. Before submitting a proposal for grant funding, project directors complete the pre-approval form, with a preliminary project summary and budget for planning purposes. Pre-approval allows planning for institutional support requirements of the proposed grant

activity. The form asks for descriptions of support requirements such as space assignment, hard or in-kind matching, faculty reassignments to be funded by the grant, student assistants, computer equipment, and other resources required to perform the proposed work. The form is reviewed by the department chair, academic dean, and office of the provost. The form is available on the COTS web site.

- 8.1.2. Faculty time budgeted as direct costs within a grant must reflect the full cost of the faculty salary and benefits for faculty members assigned to the grant. In special cases where only faculty replacement costs are allowed by award regulation, faculty effort should be budgeted at 150% of the terminal degree senior lecturer rate, in order to offset the variable cost of replacement.
- 8.1.3. Indirect Cost Sharing. Some grants and contracts include indirect costs, to compensate the University for its facilities and administrative costs. Of the indirect funds returned to COTS, 20% is retained by the college and the remaining 80% is then transferred as listed on the pre-proposal.
- 8.1.4. Grant- and contract-funded reassignment is typically limited to the instructional load for tenured and tenure track faculty, consistent with the “Alternate Assignments” section of this manual; faculty members are expected to continue their regular scholarship and service assignments.

8.2. Summer Revenue

- 8.2.1. Revenue generated through summer session will be distributed to departments and programs on a proportional basis after the college reserves sufficient funding to meet obligations that are not fully supported through its base budget. These expenses include, but are not limited to, COTS adjunct and faculty overload costs, faculty start-up expenses faculty development, grant match funding, summer chair stipends, graduate student assistantship funds, the operations and supply budget for the Museum of Culture and Environment, equipment maintenance and repair, and department operating fund shortages.

Appendix A: The peer-review process

The peer-review process: The review venue must be located outside of CWU. Formal peer review involves a process in which one's work is subjected to editorial review, typically involving two to three impartial reviewers and the editor of the journal or academic press.

- In most cases, rigorous peer review: Takes time, a response within a week or two should raise questions as the normal process involves multiple stages—the manuscript is reviewed for technical quality, then it is assigned to an editor who vets the paper for quality and appropriateness (is it a good fit for the journal) and then assign it to reviewers for evaluation, the editor receives their feedback and issues her/his letter. Although response times vary from one venue to the next, two and a half to three months is quite common.
- Will tend to emphasize substantive improvements to the scholarly content of the product, and not simply result in copy editing and/or laudatory comments on the submission.
- Will require resubmission. The editor will require the author to address reviewer comments, either by making changes in a subsequent revision, or by explaining why a change is not appropriate.
- While in rare cases a submission might be accepted without revision, this is often a red flag indicative of a weak vetting process. Unless you are absolutely sure of the journal or publisher's reputation you should investigate its credibility and you should certainly be ready to answer questions from your colleagues about the journal's review processes.

How to perform due diligence before submitting to a journal or publisher. (Declan Butler, *Nature*, 495, 433–435, 3-27, 2013)

- Check that the publisher provides full, verifiable contact information, including address, on the journal site. Be cautious of those that provide only web contact forms.
- Check that a journal's editorial board lists recognized experts with full affiliations. Contact some of them and ask about their experience with the journal or publisher.
- Check that the journal prominently displays its policy for author fees.
- Be wary of e-mail invitations to submit to journals or to become editorial board members.
- Read some of the journal's published articles and assess their quality. Contact past authors to ask about their experience.
- Check that a journal's peer-review process is clearly described and try to confirm that a claimed impact factor is correct.
- Use common sense, as you would when shopping online: if something looks questionable, proceed with caution.

Documentation of peer review:

- The college does not seek to create an unnecessary burden of documentation; there is no need to document publication or funding venues that are well known to have rigorous peer review (e.g., major journals in one's field, large foundation and government grant awards, books published by established academic publishing concerns, etc.).
- For largely unknown publication or funding venues, or those that do not have a well-known reputation for quality peer-review processes, faculty should have the opportunity to demonstrate valid procedures exist. The evidence should be included in the faculty member's professional record. For this reason, the college recommends that faculty retain records of the peer review process and all communication with editors.

Specific venues of concern for *Category A* are:

- Journals whose major function is the dissemination of undergraduate student research (faculty may use this type of publication as evidence of effective instruction)
- Examples of known journals falsely representing themselves as peer reviewed:
- Journal publisher "Center for Promoting Ideas"

- *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*
- *American International Journal of Social Science*
- *International Journal of Business and Social Science*
- *International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security*
- *International Journal of Science Commerce and Humanities*
- Journal publisher “Symbiosis Open Access”
- *SOJ-Psychology*
- *Journal Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*
- Conference proceedings where the presentation abstract but not the manuscript itself is subject to peer review
- Known print on demand book publishers lacking peer review:
- VDM Verlag Dr. Mueller
- Edwin Mellen Press
- For more examples and discussions regarding open access and predatory publishers please consider viewing websites such as: <http://scholarlyoa.com/>

Appendix B

**College of the Sciences
Merit Salary Increases for Department Chairs (CBA 16.6)**

According to Article 16.6.3, “those chairs who are judged at the conclusion of their Post-TR review to be excellent in chairpersonship will receive a three percent (3.0%) increase in their base salary.” CBA Article 12.5 on the evaluation of department chairs states: “The appropriate dean shall periodically evaluate the chair and meet with the chair to discuss the results of the evaluation. Department faculty shall provide input into the evaluation through the process described in the college evaluation plans.” In an effort to make sure the vote reflects the faculty’s evaluation, a minimum of 66% of eligible voters must cast a vote. Eligible voters (i.e., tenured, tenure track faculty and senior lectures) are defined by the CBA in Articles 9 and 10.

The Dean will conduct an evaluation of a department chair in the spring prior to the chair’s PTR review (or in an outgoing chair’s last year of service), or upon request. The evaluation will be conducted using the Department Chair Evaluation Form for soliciting faculty and staff input. Additionally, the Dean’s letter will include an evaluation of the chair in each of the items listed on the Department Chair Evaluation Form (see sections 7.7 and 7.1.4.3).

**COLLEGE OF THE SCIENCES
CHAIR EVALUATION FORM**

Check One: Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty Full-time Annual Faculty Contract Staff

Name of Chair: _____ Department: _____ Date: _____

Submit to Dean’s office by campus mail or in person no later than the first Friday in May. Use the confidential envelope provided.

*Please note: The Chair will **NOT** see this form. Rather, the raw data from questions 1 through 27 will be tabulated and distributed to department faculty and staff. The anonymity of respondents will be protected. The Chair will receive the tabulated data of Items 1-27. In a meeting between the Chair and Dean, the Dean will summarize the information collected from faculty and staff. In addition, the Dean will provide the Chair with a written evaluation.*

Instructions: Please indicate your perception of how effectively the Chair performed in his or her position during the last year in accordance with the following scale:

- 4: Excellent**
- 3: Very Good**
- 2: Satisfactory**
- 1: Less than satisfactory**
- 0: Unacceptable**
- N/A: Not applicable; no basis for judgment**

	EX	VG	SA	BA	UN	N/A
1. Has a positive attitude toward people.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
2. Expeditiously handles routine matters	4	3	2	1	0	N/A

3. Is receptive to new ideas.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
4. Demonstrates the vision to see possibilities for constructive change.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
5. Is organized and able to implement and follow through on initiatives.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
6. Is resourceful in dealing with problems.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
7. Makes effective use of available resources.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
8. Handles student issues judiciously.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
9. Regularly solicits and takes into account faculty input regarding department issues.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
10. Delegates/shares responsibility for decision-making in appropriate way.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
11. Communicates clearly and openly.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
12. Facilitates scholarly activity and professional growth of colleagues.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
13. Facilitates mentorship for faculty.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
14. Fosters excellence in instruction.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
14. Manages course schedules effectively.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
15. Manages faculty workload process effectively.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
16. Keeps faculty well informed on current issues.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
17. Accepts responsibility for his/her actions.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
18. Facilitates responsible office management.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
19. Works to promote a high level of morale.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
20. Handles sensitive matters discreetly and effectively.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
21. Sees beyond the department to the larger picture.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
22. Meets deadlines.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
23. Is open to constructive criticism.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
24. Strives to articulate administrative perspectives fairly to department.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
25. Is accessible and available.	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
26. Is fair and consistent	4	3	2	1	0	N/A

27. How would you rate this person's overall performance in the position during the past year?	4	3	2	1	0	N/A
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Please evaluate the performance of your department chair in carrying out these functions:

1. Department Operations

2. Interpersonal Skills

Leadership Skills

Summary

4. As a summary, what do you consider to be your department chair's three greatest strengths and three greatest challenges?

Faculty Senate Evaluation of Instructional Guidelines

Adopted April 9, 2014

1. Evaluation of faculty teaching should be expressed in terms of the following parameters:

- Content Expertise
- Instructional Design Skills
- Instructional Delivery Skills
- Instructional Assessment Skills
- Course Management

For suggestions regarding how these parameters can be understood and evaluated, see “I. Descriptions of Teaching Parameters” below.

2. These four parameters should be evaluated using:

- Student Evaluation
- Peer Evaluation
- Supervisor Evaluation
- Self-Evaluation

For suggestions regarding the possible roles of these participants in evaluating these parameters, see “II. Roles of Participants in Evaluation” below.

3. Formative vs. Summative Assessment

When determining the roles of Formative and Summative Assessment, it is recommended that colleges and departments have clear timelines for formative and summative assessments in terms of the entire review period in question. Specifically, over the review period, teaching evaluations should initially emphasize formative assessment, with increasing emphasis on summative, based on the following parameters that are rooted in prevailing research on evaluation of teaching:

- Progress/continued success in all teaching parameters
- Responsiveness to recommendations made for improvement
- Contributions to curriculum and/or program needs (current and potential)
- Student progress and achievement
- Growth in faculty reputation and recognition in teaching

4. “Effective” and “Excellent” teaching

University policies recognize a distinction between “Effective” and “Excellent” teaching. Distinctions should be established by each college and department, with criteria emphasizing evidence of or levels of success in:

- All teaching parameters
- Responsiveness to recommendations made for improvement
- Contributions to curriculum and/or program needs (current and potential)
- Student progress and achievement
- Growth in faculty reputation and recognition received

The following descriptions are also advisory, designed to offer guidance to colleges and departments in evaluating and establishing their own criteria that are aligned with the parameters above, in understanding the roles of each participant in the evaluation parameters, in combining and weighting the information gathered. All are supported by prevailing research in the evaluation of teaching.

I. Descriptions of Teaching Parameters

- A. Content Expertise** includes both actual expertise that can be evaluated by peers and supervisor, and perceived expertise as evaluated by students. The parameters of content expertise may include but are not limited to: evidence of faculty currency in the field, accuracy and appropriate level of information presented to students, and the students' confidence in the instructor's knowledge of the content.
- B. Instructional Design Skills** may include but are not limited to the designing and sequencing of information or activities to promote learning/achievement. Peers are in the best positions to evaluate course syllabi, appropriateness of learner objectives, handouts, media used, content organization, grading standards and tools. Students also participate by adding their perceptions of course difficulty, grading standards, connections of content to examinations, sequencing of information, etc.
- C. Instructional Delivery Skills** involve human interaction—the ability to motivate, generate enthusiasm, and communicate effectively using various forms of transmittal—thus contributing to the creation of an environment conducive to learning. These skills may include clarity in oral and written communication and presentation skills, as well as the use of technology appropriate to content and setting (lecture, lab, online, etc.). Written skills may include but are not limited to clarity of syllabi, handouts, feedback to students, graphs/charts/maps, notes, case studies, etc. Skills in technology may include but are not limited to utilization of video, audio, computers, software, web resources, etc. appropriate to course content/objectives. Students are in the best position to evaluate delivery (i.e., interactive skills) and learning environment in the context of the appearance of competence as a teacher. Peers and other experts in delivery may participate by observing classes, but research suggests that videotaping for later study is considered much better than individual classroom visits.
- D. Instructional Assessment Skills** may include but are not limited to the development of tools, procedures, and strategies for assessing student learning and then providing meaningful feedback during the course, leading to achievement and learning—effective grading practices, valid and reliable exams, meaningful feedback. These skills are usually evaluated primarily by peers, tempered by student perceptions.
- E. Course Management Skills** may include but are not limited to respectful treatment of students, handling student/course paperwork, ensuring working, useable technology, making appropriate materials available, providing timely feedback, ensuring a proper physical environment, arranging field trips, coordinating guest speakers, etc., appropriate to course content/objectives. These are evaluated best by peers and supervisors, with some student input.

II. Roles of Participants in Evaluation

A. Student Role in Evaluation

Research suggests that students are in the best position to evaluate Delivery Skills, and can add important perceptions to Content Expertise, Instructional Design, and Assessment skills. Students may participate in this evaluation process through such assessments as SEOIs (treated as snapshots of courses in a given quarter, or grouped together to show progress over longer periods), and perhaps in measures to evaluate “deep learning,” such as assessing student performance in subsequent classes or using alumni surveys.

B. Peer Role in Evaluation

Likewise, peers are considered to be in the best positions to evaluate Content Expertise, Instructional Design, and Assessment Skills, with some added perspectives on Delivery and Course Management. Peers may participate in this

process through such activities as evaluation of syllabi, course materials, course content and design, assessment strategies and tools, observations of video-recorded classes (preferably for formative evaluation only), peer review of SEOIs (individual quarters and long-term), creating/reviewing measures to evaluate “deep learning” (student performance in subsequent classes), alumni surveys, and through classroom visitations (preferably for formative evaluation only).

C. Supervisor/Department Chair Role in Evaluation

Supervisors are considered to be in the best position to evaluate Content Expertise and Course Management, with added perspectives on Design, Delivery, and Assessment. Supervisors may participate in this process in ways such as providing evidence/documentation of expertise leading to workload assignments, addressing of classroom management concerns, reviewing of SEOIs, syllabi, and professional development activities, conducting classroom observations (preferably for personal reasons or for review of documented observations), and observing video-recorded classes.

D. Self-Evaluation

Self-Evaluations are excellent opportunities for faculty to address their Content Expertise, Design, Assessment, and Course Management Skills, with some added perspectives on Delivery. Faculty should use their Self-Statements for Teaching to reflect on SEOI and other results of assessments, to present evidence of development activities related to teaching, to explain goals and objectives of courses, and to present evidence of success in teaching (student achievement, deep learning). Faculty being evaluated should also participate in the review of classroom visits and video-recorded classes.

III. Conclusion

In conclusion, the committee recognizes that these parameters and descriptions may seem somewhat prescriptive or normalizing, such that the breadth, depth, and variety of teaching strategies in all fields might be diluted or lose their uniqueness. The recommendations above are not offered with this in mind. Quite the opposite is intended. We recognize that colleges, departments, and individual faculty will value these aspects of teaching differently. We also believe, however, that the parameters of teaching themselves are something that all fields share: content expertise, instructional design, delivery, assessment, and course management are a part of all teaching, even if they are viewed, valued, implemented, or assessed differently. We also believe that all four sources of information, students, peers, supervisors, and the individual, should be considered and consulted with clear understanding of and agreement on their respective roles, perspectives, and assessment procedures in support of credible evaluation. This clarity of understanding should extend to the differences between formative and summative assessment, as well as to the distinctions between “effective” and “excellent” teaching. As a result, we hope colleges and departments will find these guidelines useful in determining their own evaluation procedures, and that faculty will appreciate the idea that the use of these parameters will provide information that is actually related to teaching. If evaluations of teaching offered by the various participants, as well as personnel committees, would express the assessment of teaching in terms of the parameters suggested, a common vocabulary across campus would develop, ensuring not only increased clarity in identifying successful teaching, but also in identifying tangible areas for improvement.

We know that some additional training for all faculty may be desirable, and suggest the following university-wide faculty development activities with an eye for common ground as well as unique challenges for colleges and departments:

- SEOIs-How to Interpret and Respond to Student Evaluations
- Peer Evaluation—Understanding Peer Evaluation, Evaluating Syllabi, Observing Peers, Online vs. Face-to-Face distinctions and evaluation strategies Writing effective Self-Evaluations
- How Faculty can improve their skills related to specific parameters, e.g.:
- Instructional Design
- Instructional Delivery
- Instructional Assessment

- Course Management

Suggested primary resource for more information:

Arreola, Raoul. *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*, 3rd ed. Anker Publishing, 2007.

[Responsibility: Dean, College of the Sciences; Approved by: Katherine P. Frank, Provost/VP for Academic & Student Life; March 2017]